



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,135	08/28/2003	Michael E. Mohle	2002B128/2	8219
23453	7590	05/28/2004	EXAMINER	
EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY P O BOX 2149 BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/651,135	MUHLE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
William K Cheung	1713

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(e). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory maximum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 42-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 42-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ISB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's affirmed election of Group I is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Therefore, in view of lack of traversal to restriction requirement set forth, the restriction set forth is deemed proper and is therefore made Final.
2. In view of amendment filed May 12, 2004, nonelected claims 23-41 have been cancelled, and new claims 42-45 have been added. Claims 1-22, 42-45 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 1-22, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Idelmann et al. (WO 97/49771) for the reasons adequately set forth from paragraph 8 of non-final rejection issued February 13, 2004.

*The invention of claims 1-22, 42-45 relates to a reactor wall coating in a fluidized bed reactor, formed in situ on a reactor wall during polymerization, the coating having a thickness of at least 100  $\mu\text{m}$  and a molecular weight distribution comprising a major peak having:*

*(a) an  $M_w/M_n$  ratio of less than 10;*

*(b) an  $M_z/M_w$  ratio of less than 7, and*

*(c) a maximum value of  $d(\text{wt\%})/d(\log MW)$  at less than 25,000 daltons in a plot of  $d(\text{wt\%})/d(\log M_w)$ , where  $M_w$  is the molecular weight in daltons.*

Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the claimed reactor wall coating in a fluidized bed reactor is different as compared to the coating of Idelmann et al. because the present invention relates to a coating formed in situ on a reactor wall during polymerization. However, applicants must recognize that the argued difference in processing steps does not necessarily means that a claimed reactor wall coating is different as compared to the reactor coating of Idelmann et al. Applicants must also recognize that the recitation "formed in situ on a reactor wall during polymerization" of claim 1, does not impart any structural properties to the claimed reactor wall coating composition. Therefore, the recitation does not carry much weight in the patentability of the present claims.

Further, regarding claims 42-45 which includes additional process-related limitations in the claims, applicants must recognize that the argued difference in processing steps does not necessarily means that a claimed reactor wall coating is different as compared to the reactor coating of Idelmann et al.

Idelmann et al. (abstract) disclose an antifouling polysulfone or polyethersulfone solphone and polyetherimide coating for reactors, vessels, lines or other equipment. Further, Idelmann et al. (abstract) disclose that the polysulfone or polyethersulfone solphone and polyetherimide coating ranges from 0.1-3mm (100-3000 micron), preferably 0.3-2 mm (300-2000 micron). Since the polymers of the coating materials are based on condensation polymers which typically have molecular weight distribution of roughly about 2, the examiner has a reasonable basis that the claimed  $M_w/M_n$  ratio and  $M_z/M_w$  ratio are inherently possessed by the condensation polymers of Idelmann et al.

In view of the substantially identical thickness,  $M_w/M_n$  ratio, and  $M_z/M_w$  ratio, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the claimed maximum value of  $d(\text{wt\%})/d(\log MW)$ , the major peak has an  $M_n$  value of less than 7000, the initial voltage potential, the V60, V120, V300, the major peak that contains at least a specific wt% of the total weight of the MWD are inherently possessed by Idelmann et al. Since the PTO does not have proper means to conduct experiments, the burden of proof is now shifted to applicants to show otherwise. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

Art Unit: 1713

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William K. Cheung

Primary Patent Examiner

May 26, 2004